arXiv:1407.3822v1 [physics.gen-ph] 14 Jul 2014

Simplicity in cosmology: add virialisation, remove Λ, keep classical GR

Boudewijn F. Roukema
Toruń Centre for Astronomy
Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics
Nicolaus Copernicus University
ul. Gagarina 11
87-100 Toruń, Poland

le 14 juillet 2014
chapter to appear in
"Mathematical structures of the Universe"

Abstract

Present-day extragalactic observations are mostly rather well-modelled by a general-relativistic model, the ΛCDM model. The model appears to surpass the limits of known physics by requiring that the Universe be dominated by "dark energy". However, the model sacrifices physical simplicity in favour of applied mathematical simplicity. A physically simpler, general-relativistic alternative to the ΛCDM model is described here, along with preliminary observational checks. Thus, it will be argued that extragalactic observations such as the distance-modulus–redshift relation of type Ia supernovae are well-modelled within classical general relativity, without the addition of "new physics".

Within the family of locally homogeneous and isotropic solutions of the Einstein equation, i.e. the Friedmann–Lemaître–Robertson–Walker (FLRW) model (de Sitter, 1917; Friedmann, 1923, 1924; Lemaître, 1927; Robertson, 1935), observations since the early 1990's—faint galaxy counts

and correlation functions (e.g. Fukugita et al., 1990; Roukema & Yoshii, 1993; Yoshii & Peterson, 1995), gravitational lensing (e.g. Chiba & Yoshii, 1997; Fort et al., 1997), supernovae type Ia magnitude–redshift relations (e.g. Perlmutter et al., 1999; Schmidt et al., 1998), and the cosmic microwave background (CMB) from the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) (Spergel et al., 2003) and Planck Surveyor (Ade et al., 2013)—have required the addition of a parameter that does not correspond to any empirically detected physical phenomenon: the cosmological constant or dark energy parameter Λ (Ostriker & Steinhardt, 1995). This "discovery" has stimulated much theoretical interest, including hypotheses of new physical components of the Universe and theories of gravity that extend beyond classical general relativity.

However, the FLRW solutions (of which the ΛCDM model is a special case) do not take into account the fact that we live during the virialisation epoch, i.e. the epoch during which dense structures—galaxies, galaxy clusters, and the cosmic web (e.g. de Lapparent et al., 1986) in general—and underdense regions—voids on scales of many h^{-1} Mpc—have recently formed. Thus, at small scales and recent epochs, it should be expected that interpretations of observational data inferred by assuming the FLRW family of models may fail. Wrong assumptions tend to imply wrong conclusions.

Defining the fraction (by mass) of non-relativistic matter (baryonic and dark) contained in virialised objects of typical galaxy scales and above $f_{\rm vir}(z)$ at any given redshift, it was shown in Fig. 1 of Roukema et al. (2013) that the evolution of the dark energy parameter $\Omega_\Lambda(z)$ follows that of $f_{\rm vir}(z)$ to within a factor of a few. Thus, as the Universe evolves from high redshift (early epochs) to low redshift (recent epochs), the virialisation fraction grows from very little to a high fraction of unity, and the dark energy parameter inferred from observations by *assuming homogeneity despite its increasing invalidity* grows similarly from very little to nearly unity. In other words, the more that the Universe becomes inhomogeneous, the more that the assumption of homogeneity leads to the sudden emergence of dark energy. This quantitative similarity, $\Omega_\Lambda(z) \sim f_{\rm vir}(z)$, reverses the onus of proof for dark energy: unless or until relativistically acceptable cosmological models including structure formation show that dark energy is needed in order to fit observational data, the simplest explanation for dark energy is that it is an artefact of inhomogeneity.

Exact relativistic inhomogeneous cosmological solutions of the Einstein equation have been known since the 1930's (Lemaître, 1933; Tolman, 1934;



Figure 1: Examples of $\mathcal{M}$assive (virialised), $\mathcal{E}$mpty (un-virialised), and full averaged $\mathcal{D}$omains in a $60h^{-1}$ Mpc$\times 60h^{-1}$ Mpc region showing galaxies observed in the two-degree–field galaxy redshift survey (Colless et al., 2003, 2dFGRS, `http://www2.aao.gov.au/2dfgrs/`) with the observer at the left. The slice is about 10 great circle degrees in thickness.

Bondi, 1947) and reviewed during the last few decades (Krasinski, 1997; Krasiński, 2006). While not directly applicable as cosmological models without sacrificing the Copernican principle, these solutions provide qualitative understanding of more realistic alternatives to the FLRW model, and can be used to model the "holes" in "Swiss cheese" cosmological models (e.g. Lavinto et al., 2013, and refs therein).

A relativistic approach to inhomogeneous cosmology that allows the inclusion of standard statistical representations of structure in the Universe is the scalar averaging approach to cosmology (Buchert et al., 2000; Buchert, 2008; Buchert & Carfora, 2008; Buchert & Ostermann, 2012; Buchert et al., 2013; Kolb et al., 2005b,a; Räsänen, 2006a,b; Kolb, 2011; Wiltshire, 2007a,b, 2009; Duley et al., 2013). As in the FLRW approach, a spacetime foliation is

chosen, but instead of assuming homogeneity on the slices, volume-weighted means (using the metric to measure volume) are calculated within spatial domains of interest.

Here we briefly describe the virialisation approximation presented in full in Roukema et al. (2013). This implementation of multi-scale scalar averaging uses the definitions, derivations and terminology introduced in Buchert & Carfora (2008) and Wiegand & Buchert (2010). Figure 1 illustrates the terminology, with complementary $\mathcal{M}$assive (virialised) and $\mathcal{E}$mpty (un-virialised) domains, and the full averaged $\mathcal{D}$omains, labelled generically as $\mathcal{F}$. Let us define the virialisation *volume* fraction

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{M}} := \frac{|\mathcal{M}|}{|\mathcal{D}|}, \tag{1}$$

which is related to $f_{\rm vir}(z)$ by

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}{=}f_{\rm vir}/\Delta_{\rm vir}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Delta_{\rm vir} \sim 100$ to 200 is the overdensity ratio after collapse, e.g. estimated for a top-hat initial overdensity using the scalar virial theorem for an isolated system (e.g. Lacey & Cole, 1993). The homogeneous Friedmann equation

$$\Omega_{\rm m} + \Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_{\rm k} = 1 \tag{3}$$

can then be generalised to

$$\Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_{\rm m} + \Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_\Lambda + \Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{R}} + \Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{Q}} = \frac{H^2_{\mathcal{F}}}{H^2_{\mathcal{D}}} \ , \tag{4}$$

where the $\mathcal{F}$ superscript (or subscript) indicates which domain is being used for averaging, the scalar-averaged expansion rate $H_{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined

$$H_{\mathcal{F}} := \frac{\dot{a}_{\mathcal{F}}}{a_{\mathcal{F}}}, \tag{5}$$

the rigid curvature parameter $\Omega_{\rm k}$ has been replaced by a spatially varying (domain-averaged) 3-Ricci curvature parameter $\Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{R}}$, and the kinematical backreaction parameter $\Omega^{\mathcal{F}}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ arises, representing statistics (variance, shear, and vorticity) of the extrinsic curvature tensor (in Newtonian thinking, the velocity gradient). See Roukema et al. (2013) for detailed definitions.

Considering the virialised and un-virialised regions together, i.e. $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{D}$, the right-hand side of Eq. (4) simplifies to unity. In addition, approximating $|\Omega_{\mathcal{Q}}^{\mathcal{F}}| \ll |\Omega_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}}|$, as found with the relativistic Zel'dovich approximation (Buchert & Ostermann, 2012; Buchert et al., 2013), the resemblance of Eq. (4) to the rigid comoving space version, Eq. (3), is obvious. The parameter required by the FLRW model for fitting observations is now removed, i.e. we set $\Omega_{\Lambda}^{\mathcal{F}} = 0$. For future observations, it might eventually be necessary to allow a dark energy parameter again, though the history of relativistic cosmology suggests that Λ is a parameter that falls in or out of cosmological fashion every few decades. Thus, Eq. (4) becomes

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathcal{F}} + \Omega_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{F}} = \frac{H_{\mathcal{F}}^2}{H_{\mathcal{D}}^2} \,, \tag{6}$$

or

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathcal{D}} + \Omega_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{D}} = 1 \tag{7}$$

for the full domain.

To evaluate these equations, we assume the stable clustering hypothesis Peebles (1980), i.e.

$$H_{\mathcal{M}} \approx 0, \tag{8}$$

virialised regions ($\mathcal{M}$) are stable, we assume an Einstein–de Sitter (EdS) model at early epochs (high redshift), and we extrapolate this as a "background" model (with parameters labelled "bg") to recent epochs (low redshift). Simplifying this set of equations leads to Eq. (2.22) of Roukema et al. (2013), i.e.

$$\Omega_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{eff}}(z) := \Omega_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathcal{D}} \approx \frac{\Omega_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{bg}}}{\left(H^{\mathrm{eff}}/H^{\mathrm{bg}}\right)^2}, \tag{9}$$

where the label $\mathcal{D}$ has been replaced by "eff" for convenience.

Since virialised regions are assumed to be stable [Eq. (8)], and since voids have to expand faster than the extrapolated background model in order to be able to become (nearly) empty, it is already clear that at low redshifts, H^{eff} will increase to become greater than H^{bg}. In Eq. (2.23) of Roukema et al. (2013), we model this with a smooth transition from the pre-virialisation epoch to the present epoch, we require that the effective expansion rate at the present epoch matches the observed Hubble constant [Eq. (2.32), Roukema et al. (2013)], and we estimate the peculiar expansion rate of voids using void and cluster surveys of approximately similar sizes [Eq. (2.36),

Roukema et al. (2013)]. An effective metric can then be defined, allowing calculation of effective luminosity distances [Sect. 2.4, Roukema et al. (2013)].

Thus, making minimal assumptions beyond the homogeneous model apart from allowing inhomogeneous structure on spatial slices and corresponding curvature, and defining averages on spatial domains rather than forcing uniformity, the early-time Einstein–de Sitter model evolves to a model with a low matter density at the present, $\Omega_{\rm m}^{\rm eff}(0) \approx 0.3$ (Fig. 2, Roukema et al., 2013). Moreover, the distance-modulus–redshift relation in the EdS+virialisation approximation is similar to that provided by the ΛCDM model (Fig. 5, Roukema et al., 2013). In other words, extragalactic observations such as the distance-modulus–redshift relation of type Ia supernovae do not (yet) require any extension to the present limits of physics.

References

Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., Armitage-Caplan, C., Arnaud, M., Ashdown, M., Atrio-Barandela, F., Aumont, J., Baccigalupi, C., Banday, A. J., & et al. 2013, ArXiv e-prints, [arXiv:1303.5076]

Bondi, H. 1947, MNRAS, 107, 410

Buchert, T. 2008, Gen. Rev. Grav., 40, 467, [arXiv:0707.2153]

Buchert, T., & Carfora, M. 2008, CQG, 25, 195001, [arXiv:0803.1401]

Buchert, T., Kerscher, M., & Sicka, C. 2000, Phys. Rev. D, 62, 043525, [arXiv:astro-ph/9912347]

Buchert, T., Nayet, C., & Wiegand, A. 2013, Phys. Rev. D, 87, 123503, [arXiv:1303.6193]

Buchert, T., & Ostermann, M. 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 023520, [arXiv:1203.6263]

Chiba, M., & Yoshii, Y. 1997, ApJ, 489, 485

Colless, M., Peterson, B. A., Jackson, C., Peacock, J. A., Cole, S., Norberg, P., Baldry, I. K., Baugh, C. M., Bland-Hawthorn, J., Bridges, T., Cannon, R., Collins, C., Couch, W., Cross, N., Dalton, G., De Propris, R., Driver, S. P., Efstathiou, G., Ellis, R. S., Frenk, C. S., Glazebrook, K., Lahav,

O., Lewis, I., Lumsden, S., Maddox, S., Madgwick, D., Sutherland, W., & Taylor, K. 2003, (astro-ph/0306581)

de Lapparent, V., Geller, M. J., & Huchra, J. P. 1986, ApJL, 302, L1

de Sitter, W. 1917, MNRAS, 78, 3

Duley, J. A. G., Ahsan Nazer, M., & Wiltshire, D. L. 2013, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 30, 175006, [arXiv:1306.3208]

Fort, B., Mellier, Y., & Dantel-Fort, M. 1997, A&A, 321, 353

Friedmann, A. 1923, *Mir kak prostranstvo i vremya* (The Universe as Space and Time) (Petrograd: Academia)

Friedmann, A. 1924, Zeitschr. für Phys., 21, 326

Fukugita, M., Yamashita, K., Takahara, F., & Yoshii, Y. 1990, ApJL, 361, L1

Kolb, E. W. 2011, CQG, 28, 164009

Kolb, E. W., Matarrese, S., Notari, A., & Riotto, A. 2005a, Phys. Rev. D, 71, 023524, [arXiv:hep-ph/0409038]

Kolb, E. W., Matarrese, S., & Riotto, A. 2005b, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints, [arXiv:astro-ph/0506534]

Krasinski, A. 1997, Inhomogeneous Cosmological Models (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press), 1–333, ISBN: 0521481805

Krasiński, A. 2006, Inhomogeneous Cosmological Models (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press)

Lacey, C., & Cole, S. 1993, MNRAS, 262, 627

Lavinto, M., Räsänen, S., & Szybka, S. J. 2013, JCAP, 12, 51, [arXiv:1308.6731]

Lemaître, G. 1927, Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles, 47, 49

Lemaître, G. 1933, Annales de la Société Scientifique de Bruxelles, 53, 51

Ostriker, J. P., & Steinhardt, P. J. 1995, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints, [arXiv:astro-ph/9505066]

Peebles, P. J. E. 1980, Large-Scale Structure of the Universe (Princeton University Press)

Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., Knop, R. A., Nugent, P., Castro, P. G., Deustua, S., Fabbro, S., Goobar, A., Groom, D. E., Hook, I. M., Kim, A. G., Kim, M. Y., Lee, J. C., Nunes, N. J., Pain, R., Pennypacker, C. R., Quimby, R., Lidman, C., Ellis, R. S., Irwin, M., McMahon, R. G., Ruiz-Lapuente, P., Walton, N., Schaefer, B., Boyle, B. J., Filippenko, A. V., Matheson, T., Fruchter, A. S., Panagia, N., Newberg, H. J. M., Couch, W. J., & The Supernova Cosmology Project. 1999, ApJ, 517, 565, [arXiv:astro-ph/9812133]

Räsänen, S. 2006a, CQG, 23, 1823, [arXiv:astro-ph/0504005]

Räsänen, S. 2006b, International Journal of Modern Physics D, 15, 2141, [arXiv:astro-ph/0605632]

Robertson, H. P. 1935, ApJ, 82, 284

Roukema, B. F., Ostrowski, J. J., & Buchert, T. 2013, JCAP, 10, 043, [arXiv:1303.4444]

Roukema, B. F., & Yoshii, Y. 1993, ApJL, 418, L1

Schmidt, B. P., Suntzeff, N. B., Phillips, M. M., Schommer, R. A., Clocchiatti, A., Kirshner, R. P., Garnavich, P., Challis, P., Leibundgut, B., Spyromilio, J., Riess, A. G., Filippenko, A. V., Hamuy, M., Smith, R. C., Hogan, C., Stubbs, C., Diercks, A., Reiss, D., Gilliland, R., Tonry, J., Maza, J., Dressler, A., Walsh, J., & Ciardullo, R. 1998, ApJ, 507, 46, [arXiv:astro-ph/9805200]

Spergel, D. N., Verde, L., Peiris, H. V., Komatsu, E., Nolta, M. R., Bennett, C. L., Halpern, M., Hinshaw, G., Jarosik, N., Kogut, A., Limon, M., Meyer, S. S., Page, L., Tucker, G. S., Weiland, J. L., Wollack, E., & Wright, E. L. 2003, ApJSupp, 148, 175, [arXiv:astro-ph/0302209]

Tolman, R. C. 1934, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 20, 169

Wiegand, A., & Buchert, T. 2010, Phys. Rev. D, 82, 023523, [arXiv:1002.3912]

Wiltshire, D. L. 2007a, New Journal of Physics, 9, 377, [arXiv:gr-qc/0702082]

Wiltshire, D. L. 2007b, Physical Review Letters, 99, 251101, [arXiv:0709.0732]

Wiltshire, D. L. 2009, Phys. Rev. D, 80, 123512, [arXiv:0909.0749]

Yoshii, Y., & Peterson, B. A. 1995, ApJ, 444, 15